UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,711	06/22/2006	Dzevdet Burazerovic	FR040002	9813
24737 7590 06/02/2011 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 PRIMARCH WE MANOR NY 10510			EXAMINER	
			LEE, Y YOUNG	
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2485	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/02/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

vera.kublanov@philips.com debbie.henn@philips.com marianne.fox@philips.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Comments	10/596,711	BURAZEROVIC ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	YOUNG LEE	2485			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	ely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
	action is non-final.				
·	· —				
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 June 2006 is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) \[\sum \] Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary	(PTO-413)			
2) Notice of Treferences offed (175 632) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	te			

Application/Control Number: 10/596,711 Page 2

Art Unit: 2485

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

2. Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

3. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Application/Control Number: 10/596,711 Page 3

Art Unit: 2485

4. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of inclusion of legal phraseologies such as "means", "comprises", "said", and phrases which can be implied, such as "the invention relates" and "according to the invention". Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

5. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: "Coding Method and Corresponding Coded Signal Detecting a Gradual Scene Change Based on Unequally Weighted Prediction".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 7. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 8. Claims 1-3 recite the limitation "the current frame" in lines 11, 11, and 13, respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.
- 9. Claim 1-3 recite the limitation "said current frame" in lines 13, 13, and 15, respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

10. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Art Unit: 2485

The USPTO interim guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility" (Official Gazette notice of 22 November 2005), Annex IV, reads as follows:

Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material". In this context, "functional descriptive material" consists of data structures and computer programs which impart functionality when employed as a computer component. (The definition of "data structure" is "a physical or logical relationship among data elements, designed to support specific data manipulation functions." The New IEEE Standard Dictionary of Electrical and Electronics Terms 308 (5th ed. 1993).) "Nonfunctional descriptive material" includes but is not limited to music, literary works and a compilation or mere arrangement of data.

When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (claim to data structure stored on a computer readable medium that increases computer efficiency held statutory) and Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1360-61, 31 USPQ2d at 1759 (claim to computer having a specific data structure stored in memory held statutory product-by-process claim) with Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory).

In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized and is thus statutory. See Lowry, 32 F.3d at 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d at 1035.

Claim(s) 4 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter as follows. Claim 4 defines a program product embodying functional descriptive material. However, the claim does not define a computer-readable medium or memory and is thus non-statutory for that reason (i.e., "When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory on most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized" - Guidelines Annex IV). That is, the scope of the presently claimed a PROG can range from paper on which the program is written, to a program simply contemplated and memorized by a person. The examiner suggests amending the claim to embody the program on "a non-transitory computer-readable medium" or equivalent

in order to make the claim statutory. Any amendment to the claim should be commensurate with its corresponding disclosure.

The USPTO interim guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility" (Official Gazette notice of 22 November 2005), Annex IV, reads as follows:

Claims that recite nothing but the physical characteristics of a form of energy, such as a frequency, voltage, or the strength of a magnetic field, define energy or magnetism, per se, and as such are nonstatutory natural phenomena. O'Reilly, 56 U.S. (15 How.) at 112-14. Moreover, it does not appear that a claim reciting a signal encoded with functional descriptive material falls within any of the categories of patentable subject matter set forth in Sec. 101.

- ... a signal does not fall within one of the four statutory classes of Sec. 101.
- ... signal claims are ineligible for patent protection because they do not fall within any of the four statutory classes of Sec. 101.

Claim(s) 5 is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim(s) 5 defines SIGNAL with descriptive material. While "functional descriptive material" may be claimed as a statutory product (i.e., a "manufacture") when embodied on a tangible computer readable medium, a "signal" and "carrier wave" embodying functional descriptive material is neither a process nor a product (i.e., a tangible "thing") and therefore does not fall within one of the four statutory classes of § 101. Rather, "signal" is a form of energy, in the absence of any physical structure or tangible material.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Page 6

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

12. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shin et al (Hierarchical Scene Change Detection in an MPEG-2 Compressed Video Sequence).

Shin et al discloses the same transmission, storage, coding device and method for coding digital video data available in the form of a video stream consisting of consecutive frames (e.g. Fig. 1) divided into macroblocks as specified in claims 1-5 of the present invention, the frames being coded in the form of at least I-frames, independently coded, or P-frames, temporally disposed between said I-frames and predicted from at least a previous I- or P-frame, or B-frames, temporally disposed between an I-frame and a P-frame, or between two P-frames, and bidirectionally predicted from at least these two frames between which they are disposed (e.g. MPEG GOP), the predictions of P- and B-frames being performed by means of a weighted prediction with unequal amount of prediction from the past and the future (e.g. backward and forward prediction), the coding method comprising a structuring step, provided for capturing, for all the successive macroblocks of the current frame, related coding parameters (e.g. MV) characterizing, if any, the weighted prediction; a computing step, for delivering, for the current frame, statistics (e.g. prediction direction) related to the parameters MV; an analyzing step, provided for analyzing the statistics and determining a change of preference (e.g. Eq. 4) regarding the direction of prediction; a detecting step, provided for detecting the occurrence of a gradual scene change in the sequence of frames each time a change of preference has been determined (e.g. Sec. 3.5); a

Art Unit: 2485

description step, provided for generating description data of the occurrences of gradual scene changes (e.g. Table 1); a coding step, provided for encoding the description data thus obtained and the original digital video data (e.g. picture, sub-GOP, and GOP).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to YOUNG LEE whose telephone number is (571)272-7334. The examiner can normally be reached on (571) 272-7334.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jay Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2988. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Young Lee/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 2485 Application/Control Number: 10/596,711

Page 8

Art Unit: 2485